THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.GOPAL REDDY

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.SWAROOP REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.11615 of 2007

Dated: 14.06.2007

Between:

Zaheda Begum

... PETITIONER

AND

1. The Inspector of Police, Task Force,
   Hyderabad and another.

...RESPONDENTS

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.GOPAL REDDY

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.SWAROOP REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.11615 of 2007

ORDER: (***Per the Hon'ble Sri Justice A.Gopal Reddy***)

This is a taken up writ petition on the basis of the telegram, dated 30.05.2007, sent by the petitioner alleging that her son viz., Mohd. Rayeesuddin was illegally detained by the first respondent on 30.05.2007 at about 2.30 p.m.

In response to the notice issued, the first respondent, Inspector of Police, Task Force, Hyderabad filed a counter affidavit stating that by serving notices under Section 160 Cr.P.C., the alleged detenu was asked to attend before the Joint Commissioner of Police, Special Investigation Cell, Hyderabad City on 30.05.2007, 31.05.2007 and 02.06.2007 and was also directed to attend enquiry on 08.06.2007 in connection with Crime No.100 of 2007 for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 307 and 120-B I.P.C., and Sections 4 and 5 of the Explosive Substances Act of P.S. Hussaini Alam in Mecca Masjid Bomb Blast Case. On receipt of the said notices the alleged detenu appeared before the Joint Commissioner of Police, Special Investigation Cell, Hyderabad, participated in the enquiry and was let off. Again on 12.06.2007 he was called by serving a notice. Though he attended on 12.06.2007, he was asked to come on 17.06.2007 due to shortage of time. But, however, on service of first notice, dated 30.05.2007, the above telegram has been sent by the petitioner to this Court and also to the A.P. State Human Rights Commission on the same day. In response to the notice issued by the A.P. State Human Rights Commission, the Inspector of Police, Special Investigation Team, Hyderabad sent a reply on 08.06.2007 stating that the alleged

detenu acknowledged the notices, attended the office, participated in the enquiry and was let off and that he was never illegally detained for the purpose of investigation and interrogation.

In the light of the facts as referred to above, the allegation that the alleged detenu was illegally detained appears to be false and the writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

_____

A.GOPAL REDDY, J

_____

P.SWAROOP REDDY, J

Date: 14.06.2007

va